REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
for
MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIPS GRANT

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001
TITLE II, PART B

2010/11

Due on May 14, 2010

These instructions are provided to help prepare a grant application/proposal for the Mathematics and Science Partnerships Program. Specific requirements are provided for key features and proposal requirements. If you have any questions, please call Abdallah Bendada at 608-267-9270.

Division for Academic Excellence
WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Tony Evers, PhD, State Superintendent

Table of Contents

APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

For Institutions of Higher Education, School Districts, and Nonprofit Organizations Seeking A

MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIPS GRANT

I. Introduction/Background

In January of 2002, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) became law. The Improving Teacher Quality Grant Programs (Title II) are a major component of the No Child Left Behind legislation. These programs encourage scientifically based professional development as a means for improving student academic performance. As schools are responsible for improving student learning, it is essential to have highly qualified teachers leading the way.

Title II, Part B of NCLB authorizes the Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) program. MSP is intended to increase the academic achievement of students in mathematics and science by enhancing the content knowledge and teaching skills of classroom teachers. Partnerships between high-need school districts and the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) faculty in institutions of higher education are at the core of these improvement efforts. Additional partners may include other public school districts, public charter schools, businesses, and nonprofit or for-profit organizations concerned with mathematics and science education. Private schools are encouraged to participate in the program. Private schools within the boundaries of any high need Local Education Agency (LEA) may participate directly in the program through the local public school district. Other private schools may participate as a secondary partner with any high need LEA.

The State of Wisconsin has been allotted $2,098,642, and the Department of Public Instruction is responsible for the administration of this program. Funds available for the Mathematics and Science Partnership competitive grant program will be awarded by the Department of Public Instruction to support proposals submitted by eligible partnerships that provide programs to improve mathematics and science instruction.

II. Program Description

1. **Purpose:** The Mathematics and Science Partnership program is a formula grant program to states that supports improved student achievement in mathematics and science through enhanced training for mathematics and science teachers. The states are responsible for conducting a competitive grant program that makes awards to partnerships of high-need school districts and science, mathematics, and engineering departments within universities, giving districts and arts and science faculty joint responsibility for improving mathematics and science instruction.

MSP seeks ways to sustain intensive, high-quality professional development activities that focus on deepening teachers' content knowledge. It is also interested in increasing the knowledge of how students learn particular content, providing opportunities for engaging learning, and establishing coherence in teachers' professional development experiences.

B. Wisconsin Priority:

1. K-12 Science
2. K-12 STEM
3. K-12 Mathematics
4. K-12 Mathematics and Science (districts with less than 2,500 student population)

The analysis of student achievement data revealed that mathematics and science are areas in great need at all levels. Further data analysis showed that science needs are growing in a faster rate. Therefore, the MSP program will target the areas of science and STEM initiatives, then mathematics. Grants will be awarded each year for up to three years depending on funding from the U.S. Department of Education as follows:

- **Year 1: July 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011**
- **Year 2: September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012**
- **Year 3: September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013**

Each project will be required to incorporate summer institutes at least two weeks in length (80 hours) each year combined with additional contact hours of follow-up during the academic year.

Priority will be given to eligible High-Need LEAs that are:

- Districts with SIFI schools
- Districts with small student population that partner together to serve a minimum of 1,500 students

Teachers in private schools located in LEAs or school attendance areas participating in these partnerships, regardless of the entity that received the grant and whether or not the private school is a member of the partnership, must be offered equitable participation.

The program will support projects to:

- **Increase the subject matter knowledge and teaching skills of mathematics and science teachers at all levels.** Programs will bring together mathematics and science teachers with mathematicians, scientists, and engineers to expand teachers' subject matter knowledge of mathematics, science, and STEM. Activities will include summer institutes that directly relate to mathematics, science curricula, and STEM to enhance the ability of teachers to understand and use *Wisconsin's Model Academic Standards for Mathematics and Wisconsin Model Academic Standards for Science.*

- **Focus on professional development of mathematics and science teachers as a career-long process.** Programs will provide opportunities for advanced and ongoing professional development activities that improve teachers' subject matter knowledge and knowledge of how students learn particular content. Projects will also provide teachers

with the opportunity to work with experienced teachers and university faculty.

III. MSP Key Features

A. Partnerships: MSP projects are designed and implemented by partnerships that include K-12 administrators, faculty, and guidance counselors in participating K-12 schools, STEM faculty, and administrators in higher education organizations. Additional partners are encouraged and may include businesses, private schools, nonprofit organizations, and teacher training departments of an institution of higher education (IHE). These partners and other stakeholders engage in the effort at both the institutional and individual levels, and share goals, responsibilities, and accountability for the project. The primary partnerships must include a high need LEA and a mathematics, science, physics, chemistry, or engineering department at an IHE. The partnership must include at least 80% of participants from high need LEAs or at least 80% of the participating LEAs are high need LEAs. The fiscal agent can be the primary High need LEA or the primary IHE. All coursework must be approved by the IHE, and all credits must be awarded by the primary IHE. The teaching staff must be employed by the primary IHE. All participating teachers must be American citizens or hold permanent residency status.

Content-Based Professional Development: The project focuses professional development on the deep mathematics and science content teachers need to understand for effective instruction, assessment, and evaluation.

1. Needs Assessment: The project must address the results of a comprehensive assessment of the teacher quality and ctive - sional development needs with respect to the teaching and learning of mathematics and science of any schools and LEAs that comprise the eligible partnership.

2. Scientifically-Based Research (SBR): The activities to be carried out by the partnership must be based on a review of SBR. An explanation of how the activities expect to improve student academic achievement and strengthen the quality of mathematics and science instruction must be included.

3. Evaluation: Each partnership project shall develop an evaluation and accountability plan for activities of the project that include rigorous objectives that measure the impact of the activities. Measurable objectives to increase the number of mathematics, science, and STEM teachers who participate in content-based professional development activities must be included. Additionally, measurable objectives for improved student academic achievement are required. The partnership shall report annually to the US Department of Education Secretary and DPI regarding progress in meeting the objectives described in the evaluation and accountability plan.

4. Eligible High Need LEAs: To be eligible for a Mathematics and Science Partnership Grant, an applicant must demonstrate a need for improvement in student mathematics or science performance for which each school/district meets one of the enumerated requirements listed below. The demonstration of need must use recent data on student achievement and teacher qualification. Further, the proposal must demonstrate that the participating teachers serve a sufficient number of students exhibiting this need.

A high need LEA is any district where mathematics or science student proficiency scores do not exceed 65%, based on disaggregated 2008/09 WKCE scores, and where there is no currently active Title II, Part B grant, in the same content area at the time of application submission, and one of the following:

2. At least 10 percent of the student population is from families with income below the poverty line as identified by the Census 2008, or
3. Schools/districts having Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) or meeting local codes of 6, 7, or 8, or
4. Not achieving AYP in mathematics based on 2008/09 data.
5. **Project Criteria:** Projects must also meet the following criteria:

- Projects must focus on mathematics, science, or STEM. An applicant may apply for more than one project; i.e., one application for science and another for mathematics.
- If participating schools are involved in a mathematics/science school reform initiative, the proposal must clearly articulate how this program will integrate with ongoing reform efforts.
- Projects employ the five components of SBR. See Definitions.
- Projects must have an active and well-defined partnership between STEM staff and schools/districts in all aspects of the grant including planning and delivery of professional development.

IV. Proposal Requirements

The proposal sections (excluding appendices) of the proposal must be double-spaced and the font used must be at least 12-point. Proposals must contain the following sections:

A. General Information: School District Partner Identification Form, Higher Education Partner Identification Form, Other Partners Identification Form, Statement of Assurances, and Eligibility. The cover page must be signed by official representatives from the IHE and the LEA. See definition for details.

B. 1- Abstract: All applicants must provide a summary that briefly describes the project vision, goals, activities, and key features that will be addressed and expected benefits of the work. The abstract may not exceed 1 page.

2- Prior Work: Repeat Applicants only: Partnerships or participating LEAs that have previously received MSP program funding must include an abstract of prior work. The abstract must describe the projects' intended goals, the amount of funding received by project year, the number of teachers it intended to serve (according to its formal proposal), the number of teachers it actually served, an explanation of how the budget was spent, qualitative and quantitative evidence of progress towards goals, a description of partnership roles, and an indication of how the proposed work differs from, builds on, or is otherwise informed by prior efforts. The abstract may not exceed 2 pages.

C. Program Narrative: The project narrative should contain the following elements and shall not exceed 20 pages:

Section 1: Needs Assessment

The project description should indicate a clear understanding of results of a needs assessment and how the goals and activities of the program are directly related to those needs. The following items are required to satisfy the needs assessment:

- Identify specific gaps or weaknesses in teacher and student mathematic and/or science knowledge and achievement to be addressed by the proposed MSP program.
- Provide convincing evidence that the LEA has a large population of students who have historically been under-represented and under-served.
- Include an analysis of objective data to establish a baseline that will guide the proposed program. (Attach relevant student achievement and LEA performance data.)

Section 2: Scientifically-Based Research (SBR)

The project description should discuss and cite the current state of knowledge to support the project. This brief literature review should clearly indicate why the proposed activities were selected or designed. If the proposal builds on prior work, the project description should indicate what was learned from this work and how these lessons learned are incorporated in the project. The following items are required to satisfy SBR:

- Provide a literature review that defines and supports the proposed activities selected or designed in this program.
- Provide references that employ sound research methods such as (a) experimental design, and (b) quasi-experimental design using demographic alignment of similar schools and/or districts and others.
- If the program builds on prior work, include a discussion about the lessons learned.

Section 3: Work Plan

A proposal must clearly describe the goals and objectives for the project. The project description should indicate a timeline and an estimate of the number, type, duration, and intensity of professional development activities and the responsibility of each of the partners. The professional development activities should develop the pedagogical content knowledge of teachers in the areas of mathematics and/or science that are a part of the state content standards. The following items are required to satisfy the work plan:

- Describe specific program activities to address the identified needs.
- Define the responsibilities of the partners. How will the partners account for all the goals and objectives?
- Include a timeline showing when activities will occur and their duration.
- Describe how the activities will increase the number of mathematics and/or science teachers who participate in content-based professional development activities.
- Explain how professional development activities of the program are aligned with the state Model Academic Standards for mathematics or science.
- Explain how professional development activities of the program are aligned with Chapter PI 34.
- **If any of the primary partners is currently participating in Wisconsin ESEA Title II Improving Teacher Quality Program in the respecting area, describe how the two programs supplement one another.**

Section 4: Commitment and Capacity of Partnership

The project description must clearly demonstrate that the submitting entity has the capability of managing the project, organizing the work, and meeting deadlines. The following items are required to satisfy the commitment and capacity partnership:

- Describe how the program team members will manage the program and meet the deadlines set forth in the proposal.
- Provide a brief description of the program team's process for meeting identified needs and deadlines.
- Provide a brief description of the program team's decision making process.
- Describe the role of each of the partners in a collaborative relationship.
- Explain how the partnership will function beyond the three year grant period.
- Provide a brief description of how the partnership selected/developed the MSP program activities, including the types of organizations involved in the process (e.g., STEM faculty, districts, and other potential partners).

Section 5: Evaluation Plan

Each application should provide a description, identify the research and evaluation methods that the project will use, and explain why those methods are appropriate to the issues or questions that the proposal addresses. All projects must have an external evaluator. DPI requires applicants to use at least quasi-experimental designs. The proposal must make a compelling case for the activities of the project and describe how the activities will help the MSP Program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, and usable body of findings. The following items are required to satisfy the evaluation:

- Provide a description that links the external evaluation to the desired teacher and student outcomes.
- Describe a process evaluation plan that provides detailed information on participants that were served as well as service delivery methods to include scope, duration, and other indicators of implementation fidelity.
- Provide an evaluation plan based on an experimental or quasi-experimental design (see Definitions).
- Provide an evaluation plan that states measurable teacher and student objectives and annual targets which describe progress toward meeting the goals and established ctive-tives.
- Describe how the activities in the MSP will increase the number of mathematics and/or science teachers who participate in content-based professional development.
- Describe how the evaluation plan measures student academic achievement using student data assessment.

Section 6: Budget Justification

The budget must clearly be tied to the scope and requirements of the project. The budget narrative should describe the basis for determining the amounts shown on the project budget page.

All proposals should include provision for evaluation of the activities in budget. The following items are required to satisfy the budget justification:

- Provide details for each budget category.

- Describe how other available funds will be used to help support this program.
- Include the budget summary.

Appendix: While reviewers are only expected to read and score the 20-page narrative, the Appendix, which is not counted as part of the 20-page limit, **may** include the following:

- Letters of commitment from the partners;
- Resumes of key faculty and staff; (each resume cannot be over 2 pages);
- Elaboration of data (e.g., charts, tables, graphs, etc.) used to establish need, or elaboration of research or evidence base used to design this program;
- Evidence of impact from prior professional development efforts; and/or

Proposal Submission and Review

6. **Submission**: Applicants must submit the full proposal to the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. The signature pages must include the original signatures of all partners. Fax and e-mail transmissions are not acceptable. To be considered for funding, proposals must be submitted electronically to the department by 4:30 pm on May, 14 2010. Incomplete applications will not be considered. Applications must not exceed 10 MB. Proposals must be submitted electronically at: **http://dpi.wi.gov/cal/t2bgrant.html .**

B. Review Process: Proposals will be reviewed for completeness and compliance with the requirements set forth by DPI to determine applicant eligibility. If the proposal is late, incomplete, or an applicant cannot establish its eligibility, the proposal will be eliminated from the competition. The decision of the department is final. Applicants submitting proposals that are eliminated will be notified in writing.

An expert review panel will evaluate eligible applications in light of the required application components and the established criteria. The review panel will review each eligible application and make recommendations to the department. Consideration is based upon the following criteria: final score assigned each proposal by the review panel; a cost-effectiveness ratio determined by the relationship between the number of teachers served, the total cost of the program; and geographic distribution.

Following the review, the department staff will contact selected project directors to discuss any modifications of the project plan that may be required. To maximize the effects of limited funds, applicants whose grants are recommended may be requested to revise the project budget and/or scope of work.

Award Administration

7. **Notification of the Award:** Within thirty days of completion of the review process, the project director and chief financial officer will be notified of the status of their proposal.

B. Award Conditions: For the 2009-2010 competition, approximately $2,098,642 is available for Mathematics and Science Partnership awards. The department will fund a minimum of three projects; however, as many as ten may be awarded.

8. **Reporting Requirements:** Each eligible partnership receiving a grant must report annually to the Department of Public Instruction by submitting the ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORTING. Further information regarding reporting requirements and forms are available on the MSP website at http://www.dpi.wi.gov/cal/t2bgrant.html.

D. Participation in State and National Conferences: The coordinators and evaluators of the grant recipients are required to attend the Fall MSP meeting, the Annual MSP Conference, and one USDE Regional MSP Conference annually.

Definitions

The following definitions are based on the definitions included in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.

A. **Highly Qualified Teacher**: A highly qualified teacher meets all of the requirements of PI 34 for the subjects and levels that he/she is teaching. The requirements include, but are not limited to, a bachelor's degree, completion of an approved licensing program, and a rigorous exam in the subjects being taught. In addition, a highly qualified teacher may be a teacher of record who is enrolled in a state-approved alternative teacher-training program.

B. **Professional Development**: The term "professional development" means instructional activities that:

1. Are based on SBR and state academic content standards, student academic achievement standards, and assessment;
2. Improve and increase teachers' knowledge of the academic subjects they teach;
3. Enable teachers to become highly qualified; and
4. Are sustained, intensive, and classroom-focused in order to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction and the teacher's performance in the classroom.

C. **Experimental Design:** The term experimental design is a research method using the power of statistics to measure the growth of a given variable or treatment of a group compared to a baseline group. The group in an experiment which receives the specified treatment is called the ***Treatment Group*** or the experimental group. However, the term ***Control Group*** refers to another group assigned to the experiment, but not for the purpose of being exposed to the treatment. Thus, the performance of the control group usually serves as a baseline against which to measure the effect of the full treatment on the treatment group. All members of each group should be selected randomly.

D. **Scientifically-Based Research:** The term "scientifically-based research" means research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and

valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs and includes research that:

1. Employs **systematic, empirical** methods that draw on observation or experiment and involve rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn;
2. Relies on **measurements or observational** methods that provide reliable and valid data across evaluators and observers, across multiple measurements and observations, and across studies by the same or different investigators;
3. Is **evaluated using experimental or quasi-experimental** designs in which individuals, entities, programs, or ctiveties are assigned to different conditions, with appropriate controls to evaluate the effects of the condition of interest and with a preference for random-assignment experiments or other designs to the extent that those designs contain within-condition or across-condition controls;
4. Ensures that **experimental studies are presented** in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at minimum, to offer the opportunity to build systematically on their findings; and
5. Has been **accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel** of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review.

E. Summer Workshop or Institute: The term "summer workshop or institute" means a workshop or institute, conducted during the summer, that:

1. Is conducted for a period of at least two weeks or 80 contact hours;
2. Includes, as a component, a program that provides direct interaction between teacher participants and faculty; and
3. Provides for follow-up training during the academic year that is conducted in the classroom for a period of not less than three consecutive or nonconsecutive days.

F. Partnership: Partnership means an agreement between two or more high need local educational agencies and the science, technology, engineering, or mathematics departments of the higher education institutes that have agreed to work together in the pursuit of common goals in an attempt to improve K-12 instructional quality and student performance in relative isolation from each other. It is expected that each partner normally contributes resources, exchange ideas, and assumes responsibility.

Conditions for success

- Create relationships between institutes not between individuals only
- Create a bond of trust and demonstrate openness
- Work as a team, for consensus and consultation
- Respect the organizational mission of each partner
- Respect the expectations and limits of each partner
- Share power, risks and responsibilities
- Invest jointly in resources
- Encourage commitment and permanency from the stakeholders
- Evaluate the impact of the project on each partner regularly

G. Other Partners: This may include educational organizations, nonprofit organizations, for profit organizations, education departments, science education and mathematics education departments. It is expected that all partnerships will contribute to the project by direct involvement, or by providing funds, resources, or services.

H. Official Representatives: The official LEA representative is the superintendent/ designee.

The official IHE representative includes any of the following:

- President/Vice President
- Chancellor/ Vice Chancellor
- Prevost
- Research Office
- Grant Office
- Sponsor Office

I. Assurances: The partnership assures that:

1) the partners will comply with all assurances associated with the ESEA and EDGAR provisions;
2) The partners will follow the protection of human subjects (IRBs), and FERPA policies; and
3) the partners will contact private schools within the partnership geographic area to give the opportunity to participate in the program.

Allowable Expenditures

The MSP program funds must be spent **exclusively** on costs associated with providing high quality, content-specific professional learning opportunities to mathematics and/or science teachers of grades K-12. In general, it is expected that MSP partnerships will spend approximately $35 per teacher per contact hour on the total cost of their MSP program work i.e. about $3500 per program participant per year. The following table provides further specificity to allowable expenses:

Category	**Guidelines**
Teacher Stipends	The approved rate per 8-hour day during off-contract time; teacher fringe benefits may be covered by MSP grant funds. All teachers must be US citizens or hold a permanent residency in the US.
Substitutes	The approved rate per day when MSP training sessions take place during teacher contract time.
Project Management Team Salaries	Not to exceed 10% of the project director's salary and 5% of the site coordinators' salaries. The salary of the program coordinators, project director, and site coordinators should not exceed 10% of the grant amount and must be covered by the Administration section.
Fiscal Agent	The administration and the management of the grant is the responsibility of the Fiscal Agent. Fiscal Agents are not allowed to subcontract any duties to a third party.
Subcontracts	Are not allowed under the program.
Indirect Costs	Not to exceed 10% of the total award
Consultants	Not to exceed $500 per day. The total funds for consultants not to exceed 5% of the grant amount.
Higher Education Faculty	Regular salary per hour of contact time. No additional money for preparation is allowed
Evaluator	At least 10% of total project budget must be spent on a formal project evaluator.
Travel	Reimburse mileage, meals, and lodging according to state/system guidelines for project-related travel.
Carryover	Carryover from one year to another is not allowed under the program. All funds must be expended by the end of each year.
Meeting Events	Reimburse travel expenses for management team participation in ED and DPI-hosted MSP events according to state/system guidelines.
Materials and Supplies	Funds may be spent on materials and supplies to facilitate professional learning of teachers, not on classroom instructional materials.

Additionally, MSP program funds **cannot** be spent on equipment (e.g., smart boards, computers, printers, camcorders, etc.), capital improvements, facility rentals, full salaries of administrative or clerical personnel, and tuition charges and/or university fees (already covered in higher education partner's salaries and fringe).

Scoring Rubric
for MSP Abstract and Prior Work

A. Are all signatures provided and all forms complete and signed by the official authorized personnel only.

B. **1 Abstract:** Does the abstract clearly describe the vision, goals, activities, and key features? Are the goals and activities aligned with the vision? Is the Summary Table complete? Does it provide enough details about the progress towards meeting the goals?

Weak	Average	Strong
The vision is not clear, or the proposal does not discuss the vision.	The vision was discussed; however, it is not aligned with needs of the project.	The vision is very clear and is fully aligned with the needs of the project.
The goals were not discussed, are not measurable or are not aligned with the vision of the project.	The goals are stated and discussed, however, they are not fully aligned with the vision of the project.	The goals were discussed very well and are fully aligned with the vision.
The activities are not clear or are not aligned with the goals.	The activities were discussed, however, they did not address all goals.	The activities were fully discussed and addressed all goals very well.
The key features are not discussed or are not aligned with the vision.	The key features were discussed, however, they were not fully aligned with the vision of the project.	The key features were discussed very well and are fully aligned with the vision and the activities.
The Summary Table is not clear or the components are not aligned with one another (i.e. the goals, activities, and indicators).	The Summary Table is complete, however, components lack enough information to ensure alignment.	The Summary Table is complete and all components were fully discussed and are fully aligned with one another.

B. **2 Prior Work:** Does proposal clearly describe the goals and objectives of its funded project? Does it delineate how the project budget was spent during each year of funding? Does it include the number of teachers it intended to serve (as evidenced in the funded proposal) as well as the number it actually served? Does it effectively describe progress towards goals through a thorough description of the work that was performed and evaluated? Is compelling justification provided to explain any unintended results or challenging situations faced by the partnership?

Weak	Average	Strong
Evidence that prior project worked with significantly fewer teachers than intended; **or** Lacks evidence that prior project worked with intended number of teachers as stated in its funded proposal.	Evidence that prior project worked with as many or nearly as many teachers as it originally intended; **or** Provides acceptable explanation of why project did not work with intended number of teachers.	Strong evidence that prior project worked with more teachers than intended according to its funded proposal.
Lacks evidence that prior project spent its allotted budget effectively and appropriately.	Evidence that prior project used the majority of its allotted budget; Evidence that budget was spent appropriately on teacher needs.	Evidence that prior project used most or all of its allotted budget; Evidence that budget was spent effectively and appropriately to meet teacher needs.
Lacks evidence that prior project work resulted in gains in teacher content knowledge.	Quantitative and qualitative evidence that prior project work resulted in gains in teacher content knowledge.	Reliable quantitative **and** qualitative evidence that prior project work resulted in substantial gains in teacher content knowledge.
Lacks evidence that prior project met goals and objectives; **or** Lacks narrative evidence justifying why prior project did not meet its intended goals and objectives.	Clear evidence that prior project completed proposed work and met goals and objectives; **or** Provides acceptable justification of why prior project was not able to meet goals	Compelling quantitative **and** qualitative evidence that prior project completed proposed work and met goals and objectives.

	and objectives.	
Lacks narrative explanation of how prior project intends to use new funding to inform or build upon previous successes and lessons learned.	Acceptable description of how prior project generally intends to use new funding to inform or build upon previous successes and lessons learned.	Clear and compelling description of how prior project intends to use new funding to inform or build upon previous successes and lessons learned.

C.1 Needs Assessment: The needs assessment should indicate a clear statement of needs derived from a comprehensive needs assessment and how the goals and objectives of the program are directly related to those needs.

Weak	Average	Strong
The needs assessment: • did not identify gaps or weaknesses addressed by the program. • provides no evidence the LEA has a large population of students who have historically been under-represented using WINSS and WKCE. • provides little or no baseline data and analysis using local assessment, WKCE, and WINSS to guide the program. • goals and objectives are not measurable and do not address identified needs. • provides no information how the partnership selected the program developed.	**The needs assessment:** • identifies some gaps or weaknesses addressed by the program. • provides some evidence the LEA has a large population of students who have historically been under-represented using WINSS and WKCE. • provides some baseline data and analysis using local assessment, WKCE, and WINSS to guide the program. • goals and objectives are measurable and address some identified needs. • provides some information on how the partnership selected the program developed.	**The needs assessment:** • identifies very specific gaps or weaknesses addressed by the program. • provides clear and convincing evidence the LEA has a large population of students who have historically been under-represented using WINSS and WKCE. • provides clear quantitative baseline data and analysis using local assessment, WKCE, and WINSS to guide the program. • goals and objectives are specific and measurable and address each need identified. • provides clear information how the partnership selected the program developed.

.

C.2 Scientifically-Based Research: The literature review should discuss and cite the current state of knowledge relevant to the program. This brief literature review should clearly indicate why the proposed activities were selected or designed. If the proposal builds on prior work, lessons learned are described and how these lessons are incorporated in the program is included.

Weak	Average	Strong
The literature reviewed: • does not support the program. • vaguely states lessons learned from prior work. • does not provide references that employ sound research methods. • does not cite research from peer reviewed journals.	**The literature reviewed:** • supports some of the proposed activities selected or designed in the program. • states some lessons learned from prior work. • provides references that employ some sound research methods. • cites some accepted research sources from peer reviewed journals.	**The literature reviewed:** • clearly defines and supports the proposed activities selected or designed in the program. • supports and clearly states lessons learned on prior work. • provides references that employ sound research methods. • cites accepted research sources from peer reviewed journals.

C.3 Work Plan: A proposal must clearly describe the program activities based on the measurable goals, objectives, and the responsibility of each of the partners. The program description should indicate a timeline and an estimated number, type, duration, and intensity of professional development activities. The plan should describe the integration of all federal, state, and local programs into the current project.

Weak	Average	Strong
The work plan: • does not describe specific program activities that link the goals and objectives stated in the program or the data provided by the needs assessment. • the responsibilities of the partners are not defined and they account for few goals and objectives. • does not define the timelines for the program. • does not describe how activities will increase the number of teachers who participate in the professional development. • does not explain how professional development activities are linked with state content standards. • does not explain how professional development activities are linked with teacher standards. • does not explain how professional development activities aligned with PI 34.02 1-10. • **has other grants such as Wisconsin ESEA Title II Improving Teacher Quality Program in the respective area, but fails to make describe the connection**	**The work plan:** • provides some program activities that link the goals and objectives stated in the program and the data provided by the needs assessment. • describes some responsibilities of the partners and accounts for how some of the goals and objectives in the program will be met. • provides general timelines as to when activities will occur. • describes how the activities will increase the number of teachers who will participate in the professional development. • links the professional development activities with state content standards. • links professional development activities with teacher standards. • links professional development activities with PI 34.02 1-10. • **has other grants such as Wisconsin ESEA Title II Improving Teacher Quality Program in the respective area and eludes to the project without details**	**The work plan:** • provides specific and clear program activities that link the goals and objectives stated in the program and the data provided by the needs assessment. • clearly defines the responsibilities of partners and fully accounts for how all the goals and objectives in the program will be met. • provides definitive timelines as to when activities will occur and their duration. • clearly describes how the activities will increase the number of teachers who will participate in professional development. • clearly aligns professional development activities with state content standards. • clearly aligns professional development activities with teacher standards. • clearly aligns professional development activities with PI 34.02 1-10. • **has other grants such as Wisconsin ESEA Title II Improving Teacher Quality Program in the respective area and describes the connection.**

C.4 Commitment and Capacity of Partnership: The program description must clearly demonstrate the submitting partnership has the capability of managing the program, organizing the work, and meeting deadlines.

Weak	Average	Strong
The partnership: • does not provide information about how the program will be managed. • does not describe a process for meeting critical needs and/or deadlines. • does not describe an explanation for making decisions. • does not describe roles for each partner in the program. • does not explain how the partnership will continue beyond the three year grant.	**The partnership:** • demonstrates the ability to manage the program. • describes a general process for meeting critical needs and deadlines. • describes a general explanation for making decisions. • describes roles for each partner in the program. • explains in general terms how the partnership will continue beyond the three year grant.	**The partnership:** • provides a management plan outlining the ability to manage the program. • outlines a clear process for meeting identified needs and deadlines. • describes a clear process for making decisions. • describes specific and definitive roles for each partner in the program. • provides a projected plan and timeline for how the program will continue beyond the three year grant funding.

C.5 Evaluation Plan: Each application should identify process and outcome research and evaluation methods that the program will use and explain why those methods are appropriate to the identified needs the proposal addresses. A proposal must make a compelling case for the activities of the program and describe how the activities will help the MSP program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, and usable body of findings. The project must have an external evaluator with strong statistical background and experience conducting research-based evaluations.

Weak	Average	Strong
The evaluation plan: • is not based on the use of scientific methods or comparison groups. • has no measurable objectives or annual targets which describe progress towards meeting the goals and objectives established in response to the identified needs. • does not measure activities and the number and characteristics of teachers participating in professional development. • does not measure student academic achievement or compare with baseline data. • does not have an external evaluator or the external evaluator does not the statistical background necessary to conduct research-based evaluation.	**The evaluation plan:** • is based on the use of a comparison group of students, schools, or districts utilizing experimental or quasi-experimental design. Description of comparison group(s) is vague or incomplete. • has some measurable objectives and targets which may indicate progress towards meeting the goals and objectives in response to the identified needs. • measures some of the activities and the number and characteristics of teachers participating in professional development. • measures student academic achievement on WKCE in mathematics and/or science assessments compared to baseline data. • has an external evaluator, however, the evaluator does not the experience	**The evaluation plan:** • provides an evaluation plan based on an experimental or quasi-experimental design. Description of comparison group(s) construction is thorough and clear. • has clear measurable objectives and annual targets which describe progress toward meeting the goals and objectives in response to the identified needs. • clearly measures all activities and the number and characteristics of teachers participating in professional development. • clearly measures the student academic achievement on local assessment, WKCE, and other mathematics and/or science assessments compared to baseline data. • has an external evaluator whose statistical background and experience

	necessary to conduct research-based evaluation.	conducting research-based evaluation are very strong

C.6 Budget Justification: The budget must clearly be tied to the scope and requirements of the project. The budget narrative should describe the basis for determining the amounts shown on the project budget page.

Weak	Average	Strong
• Budget justification is not provided or does not provide enough detail to justify expenditures. • Descriptions are not provided for all budget categories. • The budget and budget justification are not directly tied to the work plan outlined in Part C. • Does not indicate whether additional funds will be used to help support this program.	• Provides adequate justification that the costs of the program are reasonable and meet the program needs. • Descriptions are provided for all budget categories. • The budget and budget justification are directly tied to the work plan outlined. • Includes a description of how other available resources will be used to support the program.	• Provides strong justification that costs of the program are reasonable and clearly shows that the budget is sufficient to meet the program needs. • Detailed descriptions are provided for all budget categories. • The budget and budget justification are directly tied to the work plan and clearly shows how all aspects of the work plan will be supported. • Includes a specific description about how all available resources will be leveraged to coordinate services to support and sustain the program.

ESEA, Title II, Part B
Mathematics and Science Partnership Grant
FY 2010
High Need LEAs

Science

ADAMS FRIEND	CLAYTON	MADISON	SIREN
ALMA CENTER	COLBY	MANITOWOC	TIGERTON
ALMOND BANCR	COLEMAN	MARION	TOMAH
ANTIGO	CRANDON	MENASHA	UNITY
ARGYLE	DELAVNDARIEN	MENOMINEE INDIAN	VALDERS
AUBURNDALE	DENMARK	MENOMONIE AREA	WABENO
AUGUSTA	GOODMAN ARMSTRONG	MISHICOT	WASHBURN
BARRON	GRANTON	NECEDAH	WAUSAU
BAYFIELD	GRANTSBURG	NEW LISBON	WAUTOMA
BEAVER DAM	GREEN BAY	NEW LONDON	WEST ALLIS
BEECHERDUNBA	HAYWARD	NORRIS	WESTFIELD
BELOIT	INDEPENDENCE	OCONTO FALLS	WEYERHAEUSER
BIRCHWOOD	JANESVILLE	PARKVIEW	WHITE LAKE
BLACK HAWK	KENOSHA	RACINE	WI DELLS
BLAIR TAYLOR	LA CROSSE	RIVERDALE	WI RAPIDS
BOSCOBEL	LAC DU FLAMB	SHARON J11	WONEWOCUNION
CHIPPEWA FALLS	LAKE HOLCOMB	SHEBOYGAN	

Mathematics

ADAMS FRIEND	FLORENCE	MARION	SHEBOYGAN
ALMA CENTER	GOODMAN ARMSTRONG	MEDFORD	SHULLSBURG
ANTIGO	GRANTON	NECEDAH	SIREN
BEAVER DAM	HAYWARD	NEW LISBON	THORP
BELOIT	HIGHLAND	NORRIS	TOMAH
BRUCE	INDEPENDENCE	NORTHLAND PI	UNITY
CAMERON	JANESVILLE	OCONTO	VALDERS
CAMPBELLSPT	KENOSHA	OCONTO FALLS	WAUSAU
COLBY	LA CROSSE	OSSEO FAIRCH	WAUTOMA
COLEMAN	LAONA	PRENTICE	WEST ALLIS
CUMBERLAND	LENA	RACINE	WESTFIELD
DENMARK	MADISON	RHINELANDER	WHITE LAKE
ELCHO	MANITOWOC	RIVERDALE	WI RAPIDS